

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 25, 2005. Claims 39, 46 to 56, 58, 59, 65 and 66 are pending in the application, with Claim 45 having been cancelled and Claim 66 having been added. Claims 39, 46, 48, 54 and 56 have been amended, and Claims 39 and 66 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 39, 45 to 50, 52 to 55 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576 (Klosterman); Claim 56 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Klosterman; Claim 51 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Klosterman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,686,954 (Yoshinobu); and Claims 58 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Klosterman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,801,787 (Schein). Claim 45 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter and without conceding the correctness of its rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the remaining claims are respectfully requested.

The present invention generally concerns the processing of program information. A television signal is received, and first program information and second program information data, each relating to the television signal, are entered. The first program information data is associated with main program information and the second program information data is associated with detailed program information. A discrimination is made as to whether the first program information data and the second program information data relate to a same program. Integrated program information data is produced for the same program, wherein the integrated program information data comprises the main program information associated with the first program information data

and the detailed program information associated with the second program information data, and wherein the detailed program information complements the main program information. Integrated program information based on the integrated program information data is displayed in a display frame.

Independent Claim 39 as amended is directed to an apparatus, and newly-added independent Claim 66 is directed to a method.

A feature of the present invention therefore lies in producing integrated program information data based on a discrimination of whether first and second program information data relate to a same program, wherein the integrated program information data comprises main program information associated with the first program information data complemented with detailed program information associated with the second program information data. Klosterman, Yoshinobu and Schein are not seen to disclose or suggest at least this feature.

As understood by Applicants, Klosterman discloses the merging of television schedule information received from multiple sources for display on a grid guide. See Klosterman, Abstract. When multiple sources are used for receiving television channels, an overlap of channels sometimes occurs. In the case where two of the same channel are provided by different sources, a user can determine whether to have one of the channels, both of the channels, or neither of the channels displayed in the grid guide. The user's choice is entered into a coordinator via a remote control. See Klosterman, column 6, lines 34 to 56.

Although Klosterman may be seen to disclose the merging of schedule information from multiple sources, it is not seen to disclose or suggest discriminating

whether main program information associated with first program information data and detailed program information associated with second program information data relate to a same program. Rather, Klosterman merely discloses different display options for a user when channels from multiple sources overlap. Accordingly, Klosterman is not seen to disclose or suggest producing integrated program information data based on a discrimination of whether first and second program information data relate to a same program, wherein the integrated program information data comprises main program information associated with the first program information data complemented with detailed program information associated with the second program information data.

In its rejection of now-cancelled Claim 45, the Office Action cited to column 7, lines 19 to 38 of Klosterman, which describes that a user can display additional information associated with a particular show, such as a short description of that show. This additional information is displayed as an overlay, a pull-down window or as a defined information window at the top or bottom of the screen. The Office Action equated the additional information of Klosterman with the claimed detailed information associated with the second program information data.

Although Klosterman may be seen to disclose the presentation of additional information on a display, the additional information of Klosterman is seen to supplement data which is already being displayed. For example, the additional information is presented as an overlay or a pull-down window. In contrast, the present invention produces integrated program information data comprising main program information associated with first program information data complemented with detailed program information associated with second program information data. It is integrated program information

data that is used for display, rather than the overlaying of additional information onto existing data as disclosed in Klosterman. Accordingly, Klosterman is not seen to disclose or suggest producing integrated program information data based on a discrimination of whether first and second program information data relate to a same program, wherein the integrated program information data comprises main program information associated with the first program information data complemented with detailed program information associated with the second program information data.

Yoshinobu and Schein have also been reviewed and are not seen to compensate for the deficiencies of Klosterman.

Accordingly, based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, independent Claims 39 and 66 are believed to be allowable over the applied references.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



John D. Magluyan  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 56,867

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 98750v1